

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P. Dex 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/751,869	12/29/2000	John D. Wilson	END920000138SU1 (13995)	8572
7590 08/09/2005			EXAMINER	
Richard L. Catanis., Esq. SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER 400 Garden City Plaza			RIMELL, SAMUEL G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Garden City, NY 11530			2165	
		·	DATE MAILED: 08/09/2003	DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

mar	e Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050805
2) Notice of Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Pape (08) 5) ☐ Notic	view Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date de of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) er:
Attachment(s) 1) \(\sum \) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	-	SAM RIMELL PRIMARY EXAMINER
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur * See the attached detailed Office action for a 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docum2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received	in Application No
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objecte the drawing(s) be held in a rection is required if the dra	beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). awing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Application Papers		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13,16 and 17 is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-13, 16 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 17 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideratio	
Disposition of Claims		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und		-
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ 1	This action is non-final.	•
Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, I. In reply within the statutory minimun Iriod will apply and will expire SIX (Italiate, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sn	eet with the correspondence address
The MAN NO DATE of the	Sam Rimell	2165
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	09/751,869	WILSON, JOHN D.

<u>Preliminary notes:</u> (1) Claim 6 has been annotated as being currently amended, although no markings appear in the claims. It is understood that claim 6 has been amended by the insertion of the third to last paragraph. (2) Claim 7 is annotated as being currently amended, although no changes are made in the text when compared to its previous version. Claim 7 has been treated as not amended.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 16: The last four lines of claim 16 call for requirements in the parent and child documents that are not discussed in the original specification. The last four lines of claim 16 are thus new matter.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Serafin (U.S. Patent 5,987,472).

Art Unit: 2175

<u>Claim 1:</u> FIG. 2 illustrates a database system that includes a plurality of documents (FIG. 11). FIG. 15 gives an example of where the database includes parent and child documents (in FIG. 15, the two documents are related to each other).

FIG. 15 provides one relation created between a parent and child document. This relation is readable as a master index, or the total collection of such relations is readable as the master index. As seen in FIG. 2, the relations between parent and child documents derive from cross reference tables (28) which are maintained in a separate data set from the data tables. Thus, the master index is located in a separate database from the plurality of documents.

As seen in FIG. 15, the index will include taking selected field items from the parent (Document Number Field and Title Field from the upper document) and placing them in the index shown in FIG. 15. Text from both the parent document, such as "System Description for CCS for Nuplex 80+" and text from the child document, such as "Station Service Water Pump Structure" are both placed in the index.

As described at col. 1, lines 59-62 and col. 7, lines 55-56, the user can make a query on the index and retrieve documents.

Claim 2: In FIG. 15, the index establishes a relationship is established between a parent document and a child document (the upper and lower identified documents). For the illustrated parent document, a child document is identified. The same would occur in any additional established relationships saved in the index.

Claim 3: As described at col. 1, lines 59-62 and col. 7, lines 55-56, a search query recovers all the links, which means that the search query will search for the parent documents and the related child documents.

<u>Claim 4:</u> In FIG. 15, one child document is linked to the parent document. The display thus shows one linkage.

Claim 5: In FIG. 15, only the child document linked to the parent document is shown. The "pre-defined criteria" can be any criteria decided upon by the user, such as (in FIG. 15) the documents being related to the design of a specialized water reactor.

<u>Claim 6:</u> See remarks for claim 1.

<u>Claim 7:</u> See remarks for claim 2.

Claim 8: See remarks for claim 3.

<u>Claim 9:</u> See remarks for claim 4.

Claim 10: See remarks for claim 5.

Claim 11: See remarks for claim 1.

Claim 12: See remarks for claim 2.

Claim 13: See remarks for claim 3.

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments have been considered.

With respect to independent claims 1, 6 and 11, applicant argues that the present invention is not primarily directed to cross referencing the documents, but is instead directed to combining a family of documents to identify a family that includes a search term. This argument has been considered, but claims 1, 6 and 11 are not found to have language addressed to this

Application/Control Number: 09/751,869 Page 5

Art Unit: 2175

feature. In each of claims 1, 6 and 11, the only mention of searching appears in the last two lines of the claim. For example, claim 1 calls for:

"providing a search term and;

searching all said index documents for said search term.

Similar language appears in claims 6 and 11 and is the only discussing of searching made in these claims. Nonetheless, these requirements are in fact met by Serafin. As described at col. 1, lines 59-62 and col. 7, lines 55-56, the user can input a search query on the index and retrieve documents.

With respect to new claims 16-17, claim 16 has been found to include new matter as described above, and is thus rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claim 17 is indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

This office action follows a Request for Continued Examination and is made non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at telephone number (571) 272-4084.

Sam Rimell Primary Examiner Art Unit 2165